



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,759	11/12/2003	Peter Schwarze	13914-015001 / 2002P10201	7392
32864	7590	08/10/2007	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			BARQADLE, YASIN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/10/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/712,759

Applicant(s)

SCHWARZE, PETER

Examiner

Yasin M. Barqadle

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 6,8 17 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims include the acronyms OCI/OPI. The acronyms need to be spelled out. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 6,8 17 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims include the acronyms OCI/OPI. It is not clear if the "/" stands for "or" or "and" or "both". Specifically the applicant refers to fig. 5A and 5B as OCI inbound and outbound interfaces. For examination purposes examiner assumes the "/" as an "or", hence OCI or OPI is assumed. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 8 the claims read, "one or more services assigned with the one or ore types..." In line 3 what is assigned to a plurality of types is "web service" not "service". It is

Art Unit: 2153

suggested that line 8 reads ""one or more of the web services assigned with the one or more types..." Similarly, it is suggested to change, the "plurality of services" line 2 to "plurality of web services" to avoid possible 112 antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 1 the claims reads "; A system comprising:" after the first "A system comprising:" Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 12 the claim reads "communicator", it is suggested that "communicator" is changed to "communication". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 9 the claims read, "one or more services assigned with the one or ore types..." In line 5 what is assigned to a plurality of types is "web service" not "service". It is suggested that line 9 reads ""one or more of the web services assigned with the one or more types..." Similarly, it is suggested to change, the "plurality of services" line 4 to "plurality of web services" to avoid possible 112 antecedent

Art Unit: 2153

basis. Appropriate correction is required. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1-5,7,9-16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Riggins US Patent Number (6766454).

As per claim 1, Riggins teaches a method comprising (fig.1 and abstract):

storing an address for each of a plurality of services  
(col. 4, lines 60-63 and col. 6, lines 52-58);

assigning one of a plurality of types with each web service  
(col. 4, lines 10-14);

Art Unit: 2153

associating one or more of said plurality of types to an application (col. 5, lines 29-42 and col. 6, lines 43-65);

in response to a client running the application, send a list identifying one or more services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 6, lines 17-24 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4); and

in response to the user selecting one of the one or more services in the list, redirect the client to the selected service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 2, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the address is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator (col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4)).

As per claim 3, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, wherein each address is stored in an entry in a table (col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 4, Riggins teaches the method of claim 3, wherein **additional information** relating to the service is stored in the

Art Unit: 2153

service entry in the table (col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 5, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said redirecting the client browser comprises generating a URL call (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 7-40. See also col. 9, lines 5-36).

As per claim 7, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: opening a new browser at the client for the selected service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 17).

As per claim 9, Riggins teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: in response to receiving the list at the client, displaying at the client an identifier for each of the one or more services in the list (col. 5, lines 29-42).

As per claim 10, Riggins teaches a system (100, fig. 1) comprising:

a server (see server 106 and 108 in fig. 1) including a plurality of applications (col. 4, lines 10-14), each application associated with one or more service types (col. 4,

Art Unit: 2153

lines 10-14 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4), and a table including a number of entries, each entry including an address for an external web service and a service type assigned to the external web service col. 4, lines 60-65; col. 6, lines 6, 43-65 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4);

a plurality of clients (clients 114a-114g), each client including a browser (browser 284 fig. 2);

a first networked communication system operative to enable communication between the server and the plurality of clients (fig. 1, network 118) ;

a second networked computer system operative to enable communicator between the plurality of clients and external web services (102); and

an integration module (web engine 387 col. 4, lines 46-60 and col. 10, lines 40-61) operative to:

in response to a client opening one of the applications, sending a list identifying one or more external web services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application (col. 6, lines 43-62); and

in response to the user selecting one of said web services, redirecting the client browser to the selected web service (col. 4, lines 47-25 and col. 6, lines 16-25 and lines 43-65).



Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 11, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the address is a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) (col. 4, lines 60-64).

As per claim 12, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the integration module is an API (Application Programming Interface) (col. 4, lines 46-60 and col. 10, lines 40-61).

As per claim 13, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the first networked communication system is an enterprise portal (see company network 112 and 118 in fig. 1)

As per claim 14, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the second networked communication system is the World Wide Web (internet 102. fig. 1).

As per claim 15, Riggins teaches the system 10, wherein the each entry in the table includes additional information about the corresponding external web service (col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

As per claim 16, Riggins teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the integration module is operative to generate a URL call to

Art Unit: 2153

the selected external web service from the entry in the table corresponding to the selected external web service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 7-40).

As per claim 19, Riggins teaches an article comprising a machine-readable medium including machine-executable

instructions operative to cause a machine to (fig.1 and 5):

store an address for each of a plurality of services (col. 4, lines 60-63 and col. 6, lines 52-58);

assign one of a plurality of types with each web service (col. 4, lines 10-14);

associate one or more of said plurality of types to an application (col. 5, lines 29-42 and col. 6, lines 43-65);

in response to a client running the application, send a list identifying one or more services assigned with the one or more types associated with the application (col. 5, lines 29-42; col. 6, lines 17-24 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4) ; and

in response to the user selecting one of the one or more services in the list, redirect the client to the selected service (col. 4, lines 47-57 and col. 6, line 17-25 and col. 8, lines 61 to col. 9, line 4).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6,8,17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riggins US Patent Number (6766454) in view of Dias et al, hereinafter "Dias" USPN. (20030002526).

As per claims 6 and 17, although Riggins shows substantial features of the claimed invention as explained in claims 1 and 10 above, Riggins does not explicitly show wherein the URL call is in an OCI/OPI-compliant format.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Riggins, as evidenced by Dias USPN. (20030002526).

Art Unit: 2153

In analogous art, Dias whose invention is about a system of Stateful business-to-business protocol exchange where "The protocol exchange then creates, in block 826, a complete catalog URL, including the location of the supplier catalog, the conversation identifier and a postback URL that points to a location in the protocol exchange that is configured to receive a shopping cart in Ariba cXML format, in a manner consistent with that of block 646 in FIG. 6B. After creating the complete catalog URL, the protocol exchange sends a redirect message to the mySAP buyer's browser to connect it directly to the Ariba supplier system catalog" ¶ 0051, discloses mySAP buyer's browser (URL call) connection utilizing stateful protocols such Open Catalog Interface (OCI) (¶ 0003 and ¶ 0051). Giving the teaching of Dias, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Riggins by employing the stateful Open Catalog Interface (OCI) format of Dias so that that data sent in one of the messages between the entities is used in a subsequent interchange between the entities. One ordinary skill in the art would use the OCI compliant system of Dias because it provides a framework for facilitating communication between two business entities implemented using different communication protocols (abstract).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 8, Dias teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving an OCI/OPI-compliant response from the service (0051-0053).

As per claim 18, Dias as modified teaches the system of claim 10, wherein the integration module is operative to receive a response from the selected external web service in an OCI/OPI-compliant format (fig 4 and ¶ 0051-0053).

### **Conclusion**

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Bargadle whose telephone number is 571-272-3947. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned

Art Unit: 2153

are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

YB

Art Unit 2153

Yasin Barqadle

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Yasin Barqadle', with a large loop at the bottom.